

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/635,721	08/05/2003	Thomas M. Baer	ARC012000107	1943
759	90 02/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Rimas Lukas			NGUYEN, TU T	
Lukas IP Group PO Box 3295			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-3295			2877	· ·

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Brok
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/635,721	BAER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tu T. Nguyen	2877
Th MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondenc address
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reeply within the statutory minimum of thirt od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 22-28 is/are pending in the applicat	tion.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>22-28</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Nor election requirement	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	i/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 August 2003</u> is/ar		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
,		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 		119(a)-(d) or (f).
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	· ·	received in this National Stage
application from the International Bure	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	na anti-rad
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the centiled copies not	receiveu.
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Thereiow 9	ummary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/C Paper No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5) Notice of Ir 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 22-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,639,657. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims 1-8 of Patent No. 6,639,657 ('657 hereinafter) indirectly disclose all the limitations of the claims 22,26-28 in this application. Claims of '657 does not disclose the structure of the joystick as claimed in

Art Unit: 2877

claims 23-25. However, the claimed joystick's structure would have been an obvious modification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caicedo, Jr. et al (5,257,091).

With respect to claim 22, Caicedo discloses a system. The system comprises: a microscope 19 (fig 1), a laser 17 (fig 2) connected to the microscope (column 3, lines 30-35), a translation stage (column 3, lines 30-35), a joystick connected to the translation stage 61,63 (fig 3).

Caicedo does not disclose the joystick's configuration as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to modify Caicedo's joystick to perform the function as claimed for different testing purposes or different samples.

Caicedo does not explicitly disclose the claimed optical path and beam path.

However, a microscope having an optical path and a laser having a beam path would have been obvious.

With respect to claims 23-24, Caicedo does not explicitly disclose the structure of the joystick as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to modify Caicedo's joystick with different structures for different uses.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,721

Art Unit: 2877

With respect to claim 25, Caicedo discloses using a joystick to control the movement of the translation in X,Y axes (column 3, lines 30-35).

With respect to claims 26-27, it would have been obvious to modify Caicedo's joystick with different leverage ratio for handling different samples.

With respect to claim 28, refer to discussion in claim 22 above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2424. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,721 Page 5

Art Unit: 2877

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tu T. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2877

2/3/04